

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1 – 4, 19 and 20 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 5 and 19 - 21 are presented for examination.

In paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor, U.S. Patent No. 6,601,108 (“Marmor”) in view of Sato, U.S. Patent No. 6,055,530 (“Sato”).

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor in view of Sato, and further in view of LeMole et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 (“LeMole”).

Distinctions between Claimed Invention and U.S. Patent No. 6,601,108 to Marmor in view of US Patent No. 6,055,530 to Sato, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 to LeMole et al.

The present invention concerns a method and apparatus for protecting text data delivered from a server computer to a client computer over a network, from being copied. As described in the original specification, the server computer preferably determines whether text data requested by the client computer resides (i) in a protected storage area of the server computer that is inaccessible to the client computer, or (ii) in an unprotected storage area of the server computer that is accessible to the client computer (original specification / page 8, third paragraph). In the former case, the server computer converts the protected text into a non-editable form, such as a graphic image of the protected text, so that it cannot be copied and edited (original specification / page 1, second paragraph; page 2, first and second paragraphs; page 3, first, second and third paragraphs; page 5, second, third, fourth and fifth paragraphs; page 8, first, second and third paragraphs; page 9, first and second paragraphs; FIGS. 1 and 2). The server

computer preferably stores the non-editable form of the text in the second storage area that is accessible to the client computer (original specification / page 8, first and third paragraphs; elements 18 and 20 of FIGS. 1 and 2).

Marmor describes an automatic conversion system for processing multi-lingual inputs and outputs, so as to enable interoperability between computers that do not have the necessary multi-lingual capabilities. As indicated by the Examiner, Marmor describes converting text data to image data, when a client computer does not support the required fonts (Marmor / col. 5, lines 3 – 17).

Sato describes a document information management system for scanning paper documents and extracting keywords therefrom. Sato describes generating an image file from a paper document, and applying optical character recognition to the image file to extract text therefrom. Thus Sato produces an image file and a corresponding text file from the paper document.. Sato then prepares an indexing system for the image files, keyed on text from the corresponding text files, in order to efficiently search the image files (Sato / col. 3, lines 51 – 55; col. 4, line 49 – col. 5, line 2).

LeMole describes generating customized advertising web pages for a user, based on the user's profile and previous web pages that the user has browsed. The customized advertising web page pulls images and banners from an advertising database that stores content from a plurality of advertisers, and includes hyperlinks that enable the user to directly access an advertiser's web site (LeMole / col. 2, lines 13 - 46).

In distinction to the present invention, Marmor, Sato and LeMole do not teach determining whether requested text-editable data resides (i) in a protected inaccessible storage area of a server computer, or (ii) in an unprotected accessible storage area of the server computer, and, in case (ii), converting the text-editable data into non-text-editable data. That is, neither Marmor, Sato nor LeMole describe conditionally converting requested text-editable data into non-text editable data, depending on where the text-editable data is stored.

The rejections of claims 1 – 5 and 19 - 21 in paragraphs 8 - 10 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 1 of:

“determining whether said text-editable data is stored in a first storage area of said server that is inaccessible to said computer terminal, or in a second storage area of said server that is accessible to said computer”;

“if said determining determines that said text-editable data is stored in the first storage area, then:

converting said text-editable data into non-text-editable data on line upon receiving said request; and

sending said non-text-editable data via said network from said server to said computer terminal”; and

“if said determining determines that said text-editable data is stored in the second storage area, then:

sending said text-editable data via said network from said server to said computer terminal”

is neither shown nor suggested in Marmor, Sato or LeMole.

Because claims 2 - 5 depend from claim 1 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 - 5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Marmor, Sato and LeMole, taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly claims 1 - 5 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 19, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 19 of:

“said server being operative to ...

determine whether said text-editable data is stored (i) in said first storage area, or (ii) in said second storage area”;

“in case (i):

convert said text-editable data into non-text-editable data on line upon receiving said request, and

send said non-text-editable data to said computer terminal via said network”; and

“in case (ii):

send said text-editable data to said computer terminal via said network”

are neither shown nor suggested in Marmor, Sato or LeMole.

Because claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 19 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 20 and 21 are not anticipated

or rendered obvious by Marmor, Sato and LeMole, taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly claims 19 - 21 are deemed to be allowable.

Support for Amended Claims in Original Specification


The limitation of determining whether the requested text-editable data is stored in an area that is inaccessible to the client or in an area that is accessible to the client, and, in the former case, converting the text-editable data to non-text-editable data, is described in the original specification on page 8, third paragraph with reference to elements 18 and 20 of FIG. 1.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Dated: 6-11-04

Respectfully submitted,

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone: 650-856-6500
Facsimile: 650-843-8777



Marc A. Sockol
Registration No. 40,823
Attorney for Applicants